

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 2 and 3. These sheets, which include Figures 2 and 3, replace the original sheets including Figures 2 and 3. The Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is believed to have been added by the replacement figures.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed April 9, 2009 the Office noted that claims 11-20 were pending and rejected claims 11-20. Claims 12-17 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 11-20 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections and objections are traversed below.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The disclosure stands objected to for informalities. In particular, the Office states that the Specification lacks section headings. The Applicant submits herewith a replacement Specification in clean and marked-up forms to overcome the objection.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to. In particular the Office asserts that drawings 1, 2 and 3 are not properly labeled. The Applicant respectfully disagrees that Fig. 1 requires labels. The Applicant submits herewith replacement drawings properly labeling the Figures. The Applicant submits that no new matter is believed to have been added by the replacement drawings.

Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11-14 and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Maekawa, U.S. Patent No. 5,838,250 in view of Conoval, U.S. Patent No. 6,400,903. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

On page 6 of the office Action, it is asserted that Maekawa, Fig. 1; col. 5, lines 16-18; col. 4, lines 23-28 disclose "a first **mobile telephone able to set up at least one telephone link** with a second telephone over a telephone network, this mobile telephone **being equipped with at least one image-taking point for taking images,**" (Emphasis added) as in claim 11.

However, Maekawa is directed to controllable image taking device, not a mobile telephone. Further, the controllable image taking device of Maekawa is a remote control apparatus for remotely controlling in house electrical apparatuses. In addition the remote control apparatus is fixed geographically and thus does not constitute a mobile device. Moreover since the device is not a telephone it is thus not able to set up a telephone link. The telephone link is set up by the remote telephone to control the remote control apparatus.

On pages 8 and 9 of the Office Action it is acknowledged that Maekawa does not explicitly disclose "the first telephone includes at least one controllable **motor** suitable for

moving the image-taking point in response to movement instructions received by the first mobile telephone," (emphasis added) as in claim 11, but is asserted that Conoval, Figs. 2 and 3B; and col. 9, lines 30-58 does.

However, in the present Application the use of a mobile telephone has the advantages that either or both telephones may be equipped with the controllable motor enabling the use of the system in videoconferencing applications. Since the user of a remote telephone in a videoconference can control the image alignment of the images being transmitted by a mobile telephone of a participant of the videoconference there is no need for an image of the images being transmitted by the mobile telephone to be displayed locally on the screen of the mobile telephone transmitting the images. The screen of the first mobile telephone can thus be used instead to display the images transmitted by the remote telephone.

Thus, it cannot be said that either reference discloses "the second telephone includes a module for sending the movement instructions to the first mobile telephone over the telephone network," as in claim 11.

Claim 18 discloses similar features as discussed above. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Maekawa, and Conoval, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 11 and 18 and the claims dependent therefrom.

As regards claim 19, none of the cited references disclose a support device for a mobile telephone. For example, in Conoval a, digital camera is supported, not a mobile phone.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Maekawa, and Conoval, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claim 19 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is also submitted that claims 11-20 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./

James J. Livingston, Jr.

Reg. No. 55,394

209 Madison St, Suite 500

Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone (703) 521-2297

Telefax (703) 685-0573

(703) 979-4709

JJL/fb

APPENDIX:

The Appendix includes the following item(s):

- a new or amended Abstract of the Disclosure
- Replacement Sheets for the drawings
- a Substitute Specification and a marked-up copy of the originally-filed specification
- a terminal disclaimer
- a 37 CFR 1.132 Declaration
- a verified English translation of foreign priority document priority document